Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 25 1996
CLERK

No. 95-1037

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1995

MENTOR CORPORATION,

Petitioner,

v.

SAM FELDT,

Respondent.

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Fifth Circuit

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JEFFREY P. HINTERMEISTER
24 Greenway Plaza, Suite 1101
Houston, Texas 77046-2401
Telephone: (713) 960-9799
Fax: (713) 840-1160

Counsel of Record for Respondent

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO., (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

4 pp

QUESTION PRESENTED

Do the Medical Device Amendments to the federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. § 360c *et seq.*, preempt state-law claims to recover for injuries caused by a defective medical device?

Respondent Sam Feldt responds to the petition for a writ of certiorari filed by petitioner Mentor Corporation. The petition seeks review of a ruling of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit concerning injuries suffered by Mr. Feldt at the hands of petitioner's allegedly defective inflatable penile prosthesis. The court of appeals held that respondent's claims based on defective design of the medical device were not preempted by the Medical Device Amendments (MDA) to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. § 360c *et seq.*

Respondent agrees with petitioner that review should be granted to resolve the issue of preemption under the MDA. In addition, a cross-petition has been filed by Sam Feldt concerning those claims that the Fifth Circuit held were preempted. A grant of certiorari on both the petition and the cross-petition will enable the Court to examine all of the preemption issues that were decided below.

Respondent is aware that on January 19, 1996, the petitions for writs of certiorari were granted in *Medtronic, Inc. v. Lohr,* No. 95-754 and *Lohr v. Medtronic, Inc.,* No. 95-886. The same MDA preemption issues are present in that case. In light of Mentor's petition for certiorari and its suggestion that an additional case with a fully developed record would be helpful to the Court, a conditional cross-petition was filed to ensure that the Court would be able to decide the whole range of preemption issues presented below.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, and explained in detail in respondent's cross-petition, the petition for a writ of certiorari and the corresponding cross-petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

JEFFREY P. HINTERMEISTER
24 Greenway Plaza, Suite 1101
Houston, Texas 77046-2401
Telephone: (713) 960-9799
Fax: (713) 840-1160

Counsel of Record for Respondent